



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/029,638

12/19/2001

John Bankier

E003-1101US0

5044

48789 7590 08/03/2007
LAW OFFICES OF BARRY N. YOUNG
260 SHERIDAN AVENUE
SUITE 410
PALO ALTO, CA 94306-2047

EXAMINER

TRUONG, LAN DAI T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2152

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/03/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/029,638	BANKIER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lan-Dai Thi Truong	2152	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Lan-Dai Thi Truong.

(3) Examiner Philip Lee.

(2) Attorney Barry N. Young
Reg No. 27,744.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 July 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: claim 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: Lin et al. (U.S. 2002/0073211); Forlund et al. (U.S. 6,381,617); Kashyap et al. (U.S. 2002/0087912).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


 8/2/17
 BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussion regarding how the claimed limitations of: "determining the actual state of transaction at a failure; recovering from the actual state at failure; and transmitting a response message to client that masks the failure; user-defined conditions and policies for transparent failover" being interpreted and read from the prior arts

Explore whether there are amendments/ clarifications can be made to the independent claims .

LAW OFFICES
of
Barry N. Young

Court House Plaza, Suite 410
260 Sheridan Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2047

Tel: (650) 326-2701
Fax: (650) 326-2799
byoung@young-inlaw.com

July 26, 2007

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

TO: Examiner Troung, Lan Dai T. Art Unit : 2152
FIRM: USPTO
FAX No.: (571) 273-7959
RE: Serial No. 10/029,638; Filed 12/19/2001; Applicant: Bankier, John

OUR REF.: E003-1101US0

Total Number of Pages Including Cover Sheet: 1

MESSAGE: Agenda for Telephone Interview July 31, 2007 at 2:00PM EDT –
Examiner Troung and Primary Examiner Lee

The items I wish to discuss are:

1. To confirm that Office Action of May 1, 2007 pertains to the claims of record as per the Amendment of January 11, 2007.
2. The rejections under §103 on Lin, Frolund, Kashyap and Barker and the lack of teaching of the independent claim limitations: (a) determining the actual state of a transaction at a failure; (b) recovering from the actual state at failure; and (c) transmitting a response message to a client that masks the failure.
3. The lack of teaching in the references of Independent Claim 33 limitations of user-defined conditions and policies for transparent failover.
4. Explore whether there are amendments/clarifications that can be made to the independent claims to address the Examiner's interpretations and avoid the rejections.

I shall telephone you at 2:00 PM on July 31st.

Respectfully,

Barry N. Young

NOTICE: This facsimile is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply fax or email and destroy all copies of this original facsimile. Thank you.